

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

Appreciation is expressed to Examiner Jeanglaude for the courtesy extended during a January 14, 2009 telephonic interview regarding the referenced application. The substance of that interview is reflected in the following remarks.

The Official Action rejects Claim 3 as being unpatentable over the Harada reference in view of the Mine reference.

The motion control apparatus recited in Claim 3 includes, *inter alia*, a target lateral acceleration related quantity calculating means which calculates a target lateral acceleration related quantity such that when a vehicle-body speed is at least a prescribed value, the absolute value of the target lateral acceleration related quantity is equal to or less than the absolute value of a reference lateral acceleration related quantity. When the vehicle-body speed is less than the prescribed value, the absolute value of the target lateral acceleration related quantity is greater than or equal to the absolute value of the reference lateral acceleration related quantity. The reference lateral acceleration related quantity is a theoretical value of a lateral acceleration related quantity acting on a vehicle when the vehicle is turning in a state in which a steering-member operating amount and a vehicle-body speed are both constant

Regarding Claim 3 and the Harada reference, the Official Action states in lines 7-12 of page 3 that

the reference lateral acceleration related quantity is a theoretical value of the lateral acceleration related quantity acting on the vehicle when the vehicle is turning in a state in which the steering-member operating amount and the vehicle-body speed are both constant (Column 13, lines 5-20 [of Harada] where the reference lateral acceleration related quantity is a theoretical value using the steering-member

operating amount and speed at the time of the calculation as constants). (Bracketed portion added)

As discussed during the interview, that portion of Harada is actually directed to calculation of an allowable lateral acceleration based on a road friction coefficient, and clearly has nothing to do with a theoretical value of a lateral acceleration related quantity acting on the vehicle when the vehicle is turning in a state in which the steering-member operating amount and the vehicle-body speed are both constant, as recited in Claim 3.

Nevertheless, to more clearly distinguish the claimed device at issue here over the disclosure in Harada, Claim 3 is amended to recite that the theoretical value is calculated using a model of vehicle motion based on the steering-member operating amount and the vehicle-body speed. As also discussed during the interview, the above-discussed portion of Harada does not disclose a calculation using a model of vehicle motion based on a steering-member operating amount and a vehicle-body speed. Moreover, Mine does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in Harada.

Accordingly, amended Claim 3 is allowable over Harada in view of Mine, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6, the other independent claim, is also rejected as being unpatentable over the Harada reference in view of the Mine reference.

Claim 6 is amended to recite that the reference lateral acceleration related quantity is a theoretical value of the lateral acceleration related quantity acting on the vehicle when the vehicle is turning in a state in which the steering-member operating amount and the vehicle-body speed are both constant, which theoretical value is

calculated using a model of vehicle motion based on the steering-member operating amount and the vehicle-body speed.

As discussed during the interview, amended Claim 6 is also allowable over Harada in view of Mine for reasons consistent with the above discussion of Claim 3.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 6 is also respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. The dependent claims also recite further distinguishing aspects of the motion control apparatus at issue here. For example, new Claim 13 recites that the lateral acceleration related quantity is yaw rate, and a reference yaw rate, as the reference lateral acceleration related quantity, is calculated according to the equation  $Y_{rt} = (V_{so} \cdot \theta_s) / (n \cdot l) \cdot (1 / (1 + K_h \cdot V_{so}^2))$ , wherein  $V_{so}$  is an estimated vehicle body speed,  $\theta_s$  is a steering angle,  $n$  is a gear ratio,  $l$  is a wheel base, and  $K_h$  is a stability factor. Also, new Claim 14 recites that the lateral acceleration related quantity is lateral acceleration, and a reference lateral acceleration, as the reference lateral acceleration related quantity, is calculated according to the equation  $G_{ybase} = (V_{so}^2 \cdot \theta_s) / (n \cdot l) \cdot (1 / (1 + K_h \cdot V_{so}^2))$ , wherein  $V_{so}$  is an estimated vehicle body speed,  $\theta_s$  is a steering angle,  $n$  is a gear ratio,  $l$  is a wheel base, and  $K_h$  is a stability factor.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 21, 2009

By: *Peter T. deVore*  
Matthew L. Schneider  
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620